

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1898.

Number 1.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

THE PUBLIC is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with **THE PUBLIC** will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

SUBSCRIPTION, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico; elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

SINGLE COPIES, FIVE CENTS EACH.

Published Weekly by **THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.**,
at Room 822 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENT FOR WESTERN RESERVE.
OHIO: OTTO PFISTER, 316 American Trust Bldg.
(Telephone Main 1069), Cleveland, Ohio.

Post Office Address:

**THE PUBLIC, Box 687,
CHICAGO, ILL.**

N. B.—Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

EDITORIALS

No apologies are necessary for launching a paper like *The Public*. Though a wearisome superfluity of periodicals burdens the market, none satisfies the desire, widespread and strong, for a paper in which the news reports are not distorted by editorial bias nor discolored with impertinent opinions, but are simple, direct, compact, lucid and veracious; a paper which aims to be right rather than sensational; which is not padded; which clearly relates to their appropriate place in general history those events that have historical value; and which, in its editorial policy, unflinchingly puts public questions to the supreme test of obvious moral principles and stands by the result. For the paper which shall satisfy that desire, there is yet ample room. Whether *The Public* will do this or not, only experience can show; but it will make a faithful effort.

Some one has noted the resemblance of most modern newspapers, in their news departments to old-time gossips swapping scandal across the fence, and in their editorial departments to the gossips' husbands talking politics and "jawing" one another down at the tavern. Perhaps the resemblance is remote; but it is close enough to suggest to the imagination of an evolutionist the possibility of kinship.

Yet the newspaper is unquestionably a useful institution. Although editorial writers are too often mere literary machines, who, by tossing aside their self-respect with their intellectual honesty, and obediently writing at the dictation of unscrupulous bosses, now one way and now another, have taught the public to distrust the sincerity of editorial articles not verified by the signatures of writers whose eccentric sense of honor may have won them public confidence; although sensational news is padded to the bursting point with frivolous details, while other important though comparatively common place matter is robbed of the space necessary to make it intelligible; although both perspicuity and truth are often sacrificed to "hustle;" although many papers are not above catering to the prejudices of rich and poor alike, playing the demagogue now to the galleries and again to the boxes—notwithstanding all these weaknesses, the daily press, as an institution, is nevertheless indispensable. It sweeps the world for news. What if it does, as a rule, pour out its news upon the reader in an inflated daily volume of unassorted, undigested, unrelated facts, semi-facts and fiction, good, bad, scandalous, trivial and bewildering, and introduced with shrieking headlines? Most of these faults are inseparable from daily journalism. Good editing, though a few daily papers are notable for approximating to it, is not possible under the pressure of gathering news by lightning and printing it as fast as it comes in, and often faster.

But just here the weekly paper may be made to supplement the daily. Having the benefit of the great news collections which the dailies make, and

being under no constant pressure for time, the editors of weekly papers may discard frivolous details and idle gossip, may separate truth from misrepresentation and fiction, and, garnering the really valuable news of the world, may report it at leisure in compact form, and point out its relation to the news of the week before, the year before, the century before, or the age before.

Thus may the weekly paper enable ordinary men, whether they attempt to read daily papers or not, to understand the history of their own time as it develops. To him who reads daily papers, it may be a newspaper interpreter; to him who does not read them—and the number who have found regular newspaper reading an unbearable burden is not small—it may be a newspaper reader, a species of private secretary who saves his time and energy by reading and sifting the newspapers for him.

Some weekly papers have undertaken this work. So have some monthlies. And their service has been warmly welcomed. But, unfortunately, from a mistaken notion of what makes news interesting, most of them inject into their news reports a flavor of editorial opinion which not only offends readers holding adverse opinions, but breeds among all scrupulous readers a suspicion of the trustworthiness of the reports themselves. Useful, therefore, as their news reporting is, they do not satisfy the desire as to news reports to which we have referred.

And most if not all of them fall still further short of satisfying that desire in respect to editorial policy. They, like the daily newspapers, are often offensive not only to the democratic public in general, which knows of them but does not often read them, but also to many of their regular readers, on account of their abject submission to plutocratic influences.

By "plutocratic," let us stop to explain, we do not allude to the rich. Rich men are not necessarily plutocrats. Very often they are on the contrary genuine democrats. Very often, too, the most pronounced plutocrats are poor. He is a plutocrat

who, be he rich or poor, sets up wealth as the test of respectability and the insignia of industrial or political authority—that is to say, who favors government by or for the rich. Goldsmith hit off plutocracy when he wrote:

Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.

What we mean, therefore, by plutocratic influences, is influences which make for the elevation of the rich to industrial or political mastership. To these influences the general press—daily, weekly, monthly—is submissive to the extent of servility. There are few exceptions outside the organs of social reform movements. Even the democratic papers, most of them, and those republican papers which still feel the democratic impulse of abolition days, are safely relied upon by our plutocracy to turn in their tracks whenever plutocratic privileges are seriously menaced.

These considerations justify the advent of a weekly paper like *The Public*, and we repeat that it makes no apology for appearing. Whatever else may be said of it, no one can assert that there is not a field for the kind of paper it aims to be. Such an assertion would imply what is evidently untrue. It would imply that a paper which prints in intelligible form the really valuable news, winnowed from the trash that goes by the name of news, and divested of partisan bias and color, a paper which, moreover, consistently and persistently, not as an organ of some reform movement but solely with reference to fundamental moral principles, is editorially hostile to plutocracy in all its phases and throughout all its ramifications,—it would imply that a paper of that character is not wanted. We believe that in fact such a paper is wanted, and that the paper which shall realize this ideal will enjoy abundant success, not merely as a business enterprise but also as a trusted teacher and leader. Conscious, however, of the difficulties of the undertaking, we make no promise for *The Public* except that it will be held as closely as we can hold it to the ideal here indicated.

The time for urging peace between the United States and Spain seems now to have passed. A stage has been reached where war, or a humiliating backdown by one or the other of the two countries, appears to be inevitable. Neither country can be expected to back down, not even with a dip-

lomatic assumption of having carried its point; and within a few weeks, probably within a few days, possibly before these words come under the reader's eye, Spain and the United States may be in deadly conflict, and the daily newspapers full of accounts of military pomp and misery. At this time, then, and in these circumstances, however strong one's inclinations for peace may be, the most important consideration is not how peace may be secured, but whether the inevitable war shall, on the part of our country, be a sincere struggle for the extension of liberty and the inalienable right of self-government, or an excuse for giving the Cubans new fetters for their old ones.

War is, indeed, terrible. Not only is this sentiment true, but we believe it to be at bottom the sentiment of the American people. But the American people regard some things as worse even than war. In that also they are right. One of these things is tyranny. Though they patiently submit to tyranny of most exasperating kinds, when it is clothed in familiar garb or touches them in subtle ways the nature of which they do not comprehend, their blood boils at tyranny in forms that they have renounced, or which for other reasons is clear to their understanding. It is this characteristic, part of our English inheritance, which has long made the common people of the United States anxious to fight Spain for the liberation of Cuba.

That the common people are in fact anxious to do that, admits of little doubt; that their reason for it is sympathy with a people subjugated as we ourselves once were, admits of less. This war, though it must be a poor man's fight as all wars are, will not be a rich man's war. We have been driven to the very verge of it not by the classes, but by the masses. The classes, except for hot-headed youths among them, who don't know what war means, and ambitious army and navy fledglings, have thrown the whole weight of their influence against a conflict. That fact has been confusing to most of us who distrust the classes and yet have a horror of war. We have found it exceedingly difficult to burnish up our peace principles under the patronage of men of whom Mark Hanna is a fit type, who don't know what principle is except when spelt with an "a," and who would be for war as sturdily as in this

case they have been for peace, if they thought it would yield them an honest dollar or two. Their partisanship for peace has probably been as effective in fanning the war flame as any other one thing except the blowing up of the Maine. And now, convinced that war is probably unavoidable, and with the president apparently in their tow, they have set about diverting the war from the only channel in which it can be justified upon democratic principles. It is this that makes imperative the necessity for insisting that the war, since war there must be, shall be no war of conquest, no war for revenge even, no war for the establishment of a Yankee protectorate, but a war for securing to the people of Cuba—not to a class, but to all of them—the right to govern themselves. If we are to have a war with Spain about Cuba, let it be a war for Jeffersonian liberty.

But liberty for the Cubans as a whole can be secured only by recognizing the independence of the Cuban republic. That would throw the burden of making war upon Spain, and at the same time put the Cuban republic in position to expel the Spanish troops. We should thereby aid a new republic which, in the field and in its civil administration, has earned a right to our warmest sympathy and bloodiest support, if we are to expose ourselves to the horrors of war at all.

To the classes, however, our recognition of the Cuban republic is objectionable. The reason has been expressed by Attorney General Griggs, of New Jersey, the young man who advised the president that if we were to recognize Cuba, and hereafter discontented Californians, aided by filibustering Mexicans, were to resist the United States and lead her armies a chase through the mountains, Mexico might recognize them as an independent nation upon the authority of our own precedent. Attorney General Griggs objected to recognizing the independence of the Cuban republic because it does not represent the "taxpayers," and "property owners," of Cuba; and that is one, at least, of the reasons why Mark Hanna objects. That this in turn is one of the president's reasons for objecting, may be fairly inferred from the way in which Hanna has flitted in and out of the war consultations at the white house. In a word, this objection to recognizing Cuban independence is a class objection. It is an objection to government by all

the people of Cuba, and the forerunner of a plan to govern Cuba through the so-called "property-owning" and "tax-paying" classes. It makes no difference that the tax-paying classes collect their taxes back again from the underpaid labor of propertyless Cubans; nor that the property-owning classes of Cuba are in great degree mere parasites upon the property-producing classes there. Notwithstanding this, these classes must govern. Therefore, whatever else is done, the Cuban Republic must not be recognized. That is the attitude of the plutocratic elements in our country; and at the moment when this is written the indications are that it is to be the attitude of the administration.

It ought not to be the attitude of the American people. They profess to believe in government by all the people, and not by a class. Shall they, then, in authorizing a war which has thrust itself upon them, center their sympathetic attention upon a few parasitic Cuban planters, and pour out the young blood of the country to enable these planters to govern the people of the island, because, forsooth, the planters are "tax-payers" and "property-owners"? Or will they insist that the war, if it needs must come, shall be waged for the freedom and the right to self-government of all the people of Cuba, tax producers and property creators, as well as tax-payers and property owners? No true American should be at an instant's loss for a reply.

Close as are the Australasian colonies to the United States, in all that goes to make unity of sentiment—closer in most respects even than Canada—they are yet so far away in point of location and facilities for intercourse that we in this country know less about them than we do of the Russians in China. If we knew more it would be better for us. Occasionally there is an opportunity to learn something. One was afforded some four years ago by the publication, unusually extensive for a public document, of the report of Consul Connelly on the subject of taxation in New Zealand, which showed that a considerable measure of the Henry George system had been applied in that colony with unexpectedly good results. Another came to some of the residents of Chicago one evening last week, when George Fowlds, an Auckland merchant now on his way around the world, talked to the Chicago Sin-

gle Tax Club about economic conditions in New Zealand and her sister colonies. This opportunity was better even than the other, for Mr. Fowlds was present in his own proper person to answer questions, which were put to him in profusion. It would be impossible here to go over the ground that he covered in his speech and his answers. But a few facts may to advantage be repeated. New Zealand, he said, has abolished, for colonial purposes, all taxes upon industries except a restricted tariff tax of the revenue sort, all her internal taxes being now upon land values alone irrespective of improvements. For purposes of local taxation, every municipality—whether urban or rural—is permitted, upon voting to do so, to raise its revenues in the same way, and several municipalities have already voted to do this. As to public service monopolies, New Zealand owns and operates her own railroads, street cars, telegraphs and telephones, a policy from which the very best results are obtained. On the railroads, for example, passengers ride second-class—about the same as first-class on our second-rate railroads—from one end of the island to the other, for two cents a mile. And over in New South Wales, on the Australian continent, where tariff taxes have been largely abolished and the consequent deficit made up by a tax on land values irrespective of improvements, the prosperous condition of the people in comparison with those of the adjoining colony of Victoria, where tariff taxation and the general property tax are still in the ascendant, is marked. Here, too, the government railroad system is in striking and favorable contrast with our systems under private corporations. Evidently, Australia and New Zealand are countries with whose economic policies it would well repay the American citizen to make himself familiar.

Under the Dingley law the customs receipts for March, 1898, were only \$15,450,431.94. Under the Wilson-Gorman law, those receipts for the corresponding month of 1897 were \$22,833,856.46, or over \$7,000,000 more than under the Dingley law. Taking the whole period from July 1, 1897—23 days before the Dingley law went into effect—to March 31, 1898, and we find that the customs receipts were nearly \$6,000,000 less than under the Wilson tariff of the same period in the preceding fiscal year. These figures are from the last

treasury report. The success of the Dingley tariff as a customs revenue raiser remains yet to be demonstrated.

The governing principle regarding state interference with medical practice was succinctly stated by Prof. James, of Harvard, in the argument before a committee of the Massachusetts legislature, which he made last month against a bill to prohibit professional practice by others than regular physicians. The commonwealth of Massachusetts, he said, "is not a medical body and has no right to a medical opinion." In the light of that principle, the whole subject of state regulation of occupations needs revision. No state, for instance, is in the drug business; yet some states undertake to manage drug businesses in which their citizens engage. Neither is any state a plumbing body; yet in some states supervising boards of plumbers have been established whose license is a necessary prerequisite to doing business as a plumber. So, in one state at least, there is a board of examiners without whose authority it is unlawful to follow the occupation of barber; and movements are on foot even if they have not been somewhere successful, to establish state boards of examiners for horse shoers. It is plain enough, of course, that such laws as to plumbers, barbers and horse shoers are in reality for the purpose of legalizing trade unions. They are protective, that is to say, having for their object the lessening of competition among craftsmen. And they are recognized as such and condemned by the very people who advocate laws for making legal doctors and legal druggists. But they belong in the same class with doctors' and druggists' laws. All these laws are the same in principle. They are also the same in purpose. For, though doctors and druggists pretend that their aims are to protect the public from incompetents—the same claim, by the way, that is made by plumbers, barbers and horse shoers—their real aim is to legalize, in the medical profession and among druggists, something in the nature of a trade union—something that will give the trade legal power over the people. The state has no right to make such laws. And one of the reasons is that which Prof. James expressed. It is not a medical, nor a plumbing, nor a tonsorial, nor a horse-shoeing body, and has no right, as a state, to an opinion on medicine, or plumbing, or tonsorial skill, or horse-shoeing. It is every man's right as

much to employ the medical aid which he wisely or unwisely thinks he needs, as it is to employ the plumber, the barber or the horse-shoer whom he wisely or unwisely prefers. That the Massachusetts legislature took this view and refused to pass the doctors' exclusion bill, which Prof. James opposed, is matter for congratulation.

Gold standard men who are also protectionists should be interested in that part of the address of President Diaz to the Mexican congress in which he speaks of the so-called depreciated Mexican dollar as a powerful factor in promoting protection. By discouraging foreign trade, so says Diaz, this dollar stimulates Mexican manufactures; and that is the prime object of protection. Silver coinage free traders, also, should be interested in this part of Diaz's address, and for similar reasons. If silver coinage is in truth a protective measure, both protectionists who oppose it and free traders who advocate it will need to revise their opinions somewhat, either as to coinage or customs.

HENRY GEORGE'S LAST BOOK.

Every one of Henry George's books is vital with intelligent and honest thought. He never wrote perfunctorily. Yet in the last twenty years of his life—years devoted also to making a living, for books like his, though they circulated widely, could in the nature of things yield to their author but scant pecuniary returns—he prepared for publication no less than eight volumes. "Progress and Poverty" came first. Begun in 1877, it appeared in 1879. This was followed by "The Land Question," which was written with especial reference to the "no rent" agitation in Ireland; by "Property in Land," a controversy with the Duke of Argyle; by "Social Problems," "Protection or Free Trade," and "The Condition of Labor," the latter being an open letter to the pope in reply to his encyclical on labor; and by "A Perplexed Philosopher," an exhortation of Herbert Spencer for his surrender to aristocratic attractions. These were published in the order in which they are named. Finally comes "The Science of Political Economy," the unfinished manuscript of which almost literally dropped from the author's hands when he died. Considered by itself, each volume is a great book; any of the eight would have perpetuated Henry George's memory had none of the others been written.

But his monumental books are the first and the last.

"Progress and Poverty," laboriously thought out as a pioneer work, was in sober truth what inferior publications are sometimes said to be, an epoch-making book. Prior to its appearance Americans when asked by supercilious foreigners, "Who ever reads an American book?" could point in dumb reply to but one book, and that a novel. This situation was changed by "Progress and Poverty." The extent to which the world has read that American book is indicated by its large circulation in all English-speaking countries and the great number of alien tongues into which it has been translated.

Nor was "Progress and Poverty" merely circulated and read. It did and is still doing the work for which its author intended it. While in one sense the sneer of the "aristocracy of culture," that it has not influenced the universities, may be true, yet in another and an important sense it certainly is not true. The book has failed, indeed, to convert the professorial cult in political economy. How could it help but fail, when the professor who should become an outspoken convert would be pushed out of his university chair? Nevertheless, it has forced that cult to abandon old fallacies and invent new ones. We say this advisedly. Though other writers had previously protested against some of the old fallacies, Henry George did more than protest; he tore them all up by the roots. The "about face" movement of the professors of political economy dates from the time when George's book made its impress upon the public mind. That book forced the professorial cult to try to turn political economy into an occult science and its professors into economic mahatmas.

But better still than its influence upon the universities—for universities are at the best but mummy cases of thought; they preserve old wisdom but seldom give birth to new—has been the beneficent influence of "Progress and Poverty" upon the masses. This influence and its effects, though they do not lend themselves to statistical expression, are evident in a thousand different ways. He who is not cognizant of them must be intellectually blind. They appear in all circles, being usually shown in a better attitude toward

industrial questions, but not infrequently in unqualified acceptance of the doctrines of the book. Neither pulpit nor bar, counting-room nor factory, court nor legislature, congress nor parliament, has wholly escaped this influence or is wholly free from its beneficent effects. Even socialists who oppose the book as individualistic, and individualists who condemn it as socialistic, have caught inspiration from it. Social problems are better formulated in the public mind than they could possibly be if "Progress and Poverty" and its influence were obliterated. Already this volume stands out in bold relief, to minds capable of passing judgment upon the great events of their own time, as the most influential and enduring book of the century.

But "Progress and Poverty" is not a treatise. While it does recast political economy in some vital particulars, it does not systematize the science. The intention of its author was to leave that work to other hands. He assumed that if this book should command wide attention, professors of political economy, recognizing the truths it put forth, would undertake the task of harmonizing those truths with the science as a whole. But his assumption proved unfounded. Though "Progress and Poverty" instantly commanded wide attention; though it has become more famous than any other work on political economy—Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" alone excepted; though its influence in less than twenty years has been greater than that of even the "Wealth of Nations" in a century; though it is the only economic work except Smith's and Mill's which the man of general culture needs to have read, yet the professors of political economy, when they have not misrepresented have ignored it. So the work which Henry George expected them to do, he having pointed out the way, fell at last upon himself.

Setting about his task as far back as 1888, he continued it, with frequent interruptions—now to lecture at the antipodes, again to write a book or two upon subjects requiring immediate attention, and at other times to deliver lectures and write magazine articles urgently sought for—until the historic mayoralty campaign of Greater New York in the autumn of 1897, near the culmination of which he suddenly died. The result of this labor is "The Science of Political Economy," recently published

by the Doubleday & McClure company, New York, as a posthumous work.

In this book, more noticeably even than in "Progress and Poverty," George assumes the role, not of a tutor giving instruction in mysteries, but of a guide who points out what may be seen merely by looking. He did not regard political economy as a body of esoteric knowledge, in respect of which ordinary men must unquestioningly accept the dicta of authority. He held, on the contrary, that those who would understand political economy must distrust mere authority and use their own faculty for observation and their own reason. And this he considered it easier in respect to political economy than to any other science, for ordinary men to do. For political economy, to quote his own language, "requires no tools, no apparatus, no special learning. The phenomena which it investigates need not be sought for in laboratories or libraries; they lie about us and are constantly thrust upon us. The principles on which it builds are truths of which we are all conscious and on which in everyday matters we constantly base our reasoning and our actions. And its processes, which consist mainly in analysis, require only care in distinguishing what is essential from what is merely accidental."

These processes, however, demand precise definitions for distinguishing words. Not that there is any magic in definitions, but that unless the meaning of distinguishing words is so fixed and so clear that the same word always makes the same distinctions, confusion is inevitable, not only in the mind of the person reasoned with, but also in that of the person who reasons. Accordingly, George begins by defining the nature and scope of political economy itself.

This is really done by the earliest definition, which he fully accepts, namely, that political economy is "the science that treats of the nature of wealth and of the laws of its production and distribution." But as that definition has never been quite understood by the professors, and has lately been abandoned by them, he directs attention to the very beginnings of things, and leads on step by step until the most obtuse reader, be he professor or peasant, may see for himself just what political economy is.

Turning for this purpose to the whole system of things of which man

is cognizant and is himself a part, George observes that this system, as it is presented to our perceptions, exhibits three factors, which, though possibly in essence one, are clearly distinguishable in thought as three. He distinguishes them by the terms spirit, matter and energy. Spirit is that which feels, perceives, thinks, wills; matter is that which has weight and form; energy is that which, acting on matter, produces movement. Of these three factors, spirit comes first. It is the factor which initiates. So evident is this that every attempt to account for the origin of our system culminates in the assumption of a Great Spirit, or God. If atheistic theories admit no such assumption, it is because they avoid the question of origin altogether and assume the world always to have been.

Spirit being the factor which initiates, it is therefore the factor which distinguishes man from the other animals. Of all the animals, man alone initiates. Though other animals produce—some of them with surpassing perfection—it is not as originators, nor even as imitators. They produce by an instinct—under the direction of spirit from without—which prompts them unflinchingly and unalteringly to go so far but no farther. Not so with man. He directs his activities by spirit from within, by a power that we call reason. It is this that makes man so vastly superior to the other animals as to take him out of their class. He differs from them not in degree but in kind. George admits in this connection that there are differences between savages and civilized men so great as to seem also to be differences of kind; but he does not consider these as residing in the individual. He argues that they are traceable to differences in civilization.

Civilization he attributes to the welding together of individuals, by cooperation, into a social or economic body. It is at this point that he regards political economy as having its beginning. Man is a social animal, so his argument runs, formed to live and cooperate with his fellows; and as individuals adapt themselves to this relationship they merge "into a social body, a larger entity, which has life and character of its own, and continues its existence while its components change, just as the life and characteristics of our bodily frame continue though the atoms of which it is composed are constantly passing away from it and as constantly being replaced." To the development of this

larger entity, and not to individual development, George attributes the differences between savage and civilized men; and this development he regards as synonymous with the development of political economy. By cooperation, however, he alludes neither to socialism nor to any other consciously directed system of profit-sharing, but to something which lies deeper in, and is of the very nature of, the social organism. He does not allude even to the state. But, taking a hint from Hobbes, who in writing of the state named it Leviathan, George names the social or economic body to which he does allude a Greater Leviathan, thereby implying not only that this body is a combination, as distinguished from an aggregation, of the constantly changing units which compose it, but also that it is prior to and greater than the state—the state being merely one of its outgrowths or expressions. It is in this Greater Leviathan, this larger man, that, in George's estimation, civilization is secured and perpetuated. And, just as he regards the economy of one individual, or of more than one but less than the whole number of individuals that constitute the Greater Leviathan, as personal or private economy, so he regards the economy of the Greater Leviathan itself as political economy.

Thus the cooperation meant, which is regarded as marking the beginning of political as distinguished from personal or private economy, is caused by the same faculty that makes man the only producer among animals—by that faculty, possessed by man alone among the animals, which has been distinguished as spirit. His reasoning faculty enables man to see what the animal cannot, that by means of trading a net increase in satisfaction is obtainable; and it is along the line of trading so generated that the Greater Leviathan, or body economic, is evolved and developed. Individual desires, seeking satisfaction through trade, operate like "the microscopic hooks which are said to give its felt quality to wool, to unite individuals in a mutual cooperation that would weld them together as interdependent members of an organism, larger, wider and stronger than the individual man."

Having thus indicated the kind of economy that political economy is, namely, the economy not of individuals as such, nor of the political organization called the "state" or "nation," but of that natural economic organism which he calls Greater Leviathan,

George advances to a consideration of the nature of science, his purpose being the more clearly to point out the foundations upon which political economy, as a science, must rest. Here he digs down to the rock bottom of natural law.

Some sequences, he observes, are invariable, certain results always following certain antecedents. The connection between the cause and the effect in these invariable sequences, which are rightly called consequences, we call a law of nature. In tracing laws of nature we are apt to discover that the first cause found which explains an effect is not the first cause in the sequence, but is itself an effect of some preceding cause, which in turn is an effect of still another cause. Our search is thus extended from one link to another in the chain of causation until we come to what we apprehend to be the first cause in the sequence—the sufficient cause for the effect.

This sufficient cause involves that factor or element which has been distinguished as spirit. For the human reason is satisfied with no explanation of an effect which does not set forth a cause that may be conceived of as acting in itself. We should not be satisfied, for illustration, with a theory of the death of a man killed with a club, which explained that he died because a club struck him; we must know what will was behind the club. Nor are we satisfied even with that. We must also know the motive which moved the will to action. So, when we go beyond the domain of human will and motive, and enter the field of natural law, we are not satisfied with knowing the effects, nor with knowing that the effects have causes which cannot be conceived of as acting in themselves. We are constrained to push our speculations back to spirit—to a will and a motive sufficient to account for the universe.

When we do this there grows upon us "the apprehension of an order and co-relation in things, which we can understand only by assuming unity of will and comprehensiveness of intent—of an all-embracing system or order which we personify as Nature, and of a great 'I am' from whose exertion of will all things visible and invisible proceed, and which is the first or all-beginning cause." Indeed, this all-beginning cause is suggested by the very phrase, "law of nature." Though used to express merely the fact of invariable relation, that phrase involves the idea of a causative will. To such

recognition of spirit, George concludes, our reason must come before it can rest content, and beyond that it cannot go. And it is in the knowledges which relate results to this will, to the law of nature, that science really consists. There is no basis for scientific knowledge in human laws, which are merely expressions of the mutable will of man; but upon natural laws, which are expressions of the immutable will of God, and upon these alone, true science rests.

Attentive readers of George's book will observe that up to this point he has established two propositions: First, that political economy is the economy of Greater Leviathan—of the body social or economic, as a whole; and, second, that if it is a science it must, in accordance with the rules of all science, seek for causes in that supreme will and motive which in science goes by the name of natural law. Having also shown that the natural laws with which the science of political economy is concerned, begin to operate when that cooperation which evolves and develops the body economic or Greater Leviathan sets in, he then proceeds to define the scope of political economy.

Since this science treats of the production and distribution of wealth, he finds it to include or involve "almost if not quite the whole body social, with all its parts, powers and functions, and the natural laws under which they operate," for wealth is to the Greater Leviathan very much what blood is to the individual men who compose it. The scope of the science might be roughly indicated, he continues, if we called it the science which explains how civilized men get a living. But this would need modification. For political economy does not undertake to explain how some civilized men get a living; that is the function of private, or personal, or family economy. Some men may get a living either by rendering service or by extorting service. But men in general can get a living only by rendering service; and it is with men in general, not with particular men, that political economy is concerned. We might say, therefore, that political economy is the science which explains how civilized men in general, or as a whole, get a living. It is related, that is to say, directly, at any rate, only to the natural laws which govern the production and distribution of wealth in the social organism.

This distinction between private economy and political economy has peculiar importance in connection with nearly all the vital points upon which George differs from the economic professors. What they teach, as George very clearly shows, is not political economy at all, but private economy. Their science, instead of explaining the laws of general "wealthiness," as George calls it, is best characterized by the spirit of that aphorism of the old man who advised his son: "Get rich, my son; honestly, if possible, but get rich." When a so-called science of political economy presumes to treat the value of houses, which adds to the aggregate of values, as economically identical with the value of land, which enriches the owner only as it impoverishes others, George is entirely justified in his conclusion that the university economics of to-day have slid out of political economy and into the field of personal economy, a field in which things that enrich the owner may do so by impoverishing some one else.

As regards methods of study, George advocates seeking first principles and tracing out main lines, so as to comprehend the skeleton of their relation and understand their intent. Details are more readily understood, he explains, when the clew of intention is once gained.

Adopting this method, he finds that all the complex movements with which political economy is concerned originate in the exertion of human will, with the desire for material satisfactions as its motive, and have for their means the matter and energy which nature offers to man, and the natural laws which these obey. The phenomena that political economy explains, therefore, are human actions intended for the attainment of material satisfactions; and the laws it seeks to discover are those laws of man's own nature which affect his actions in changing natural materials—in place, form or relation—so as to satisfy his wants. And inasmuch as the three factors already distinguished as spirit, matter and energy are conjoined, both in man and in his natural environment—man himself embodying all three, and his natural environment consisting of matter and energy directed by superior spirit or natural law—the three original factors of the world may be reduced in political economy to Man and Nature, Man being the active factor and Nature the passive. From these two fac-

tors proceed all things with which political economy has to do.

It must not be assumed, however, that by desire for material satisfactions George means animal satisfactions exclusively. Much that we are accustomed to call immaterial, he explains, is in fact bound up with the material. We can have no cognizance, for instance, even of such spiritual things as love, knowledge or happiness, except through the material; and when we consider how universally, on this plane of our existence, the spiritual is thus linked with the material, the importance of material desires and satisfactions becomes clear.

It only remains, in this connection, to state the fundamental law of political economy which George postulates. Since man, the active factor, can satisfy desire only by action, and since action tends to weariness, men invariably seek to satisfy their desires with the least exertion. That is the law. It does not mean that they always adopt the least irksome method, nor that the law itself is an expression of selfishness; but simply that men "will always seek the way which under existing physical, social and personal conditions seems to them to involve the least expenditure of exertion," and that "men always do this whether their desires be selfish or unselfish." The law is simply an expression of a fact, the fundamental fact of the science of political economy. By it the subsidiary laws of that science—those of the distribution as well as those of the production of wealth—are governed and explained.

Such in outline is the first or introductory division of Henry George's last book. It is followed by three others. To present these even in the barest outline would overrun our available space; but, reserving for future discussion the controversial matters with which they largely deal—such as the money question, the question of socialism, the law of diminishing returns, the doctrines of value, and the various conflicts of the economic schools—we shall here attempt simply to state George's position on the leading points.

As the result of an extended discussion of value, one of the conceded characteristics of wealth, in which he finds value to be of two radically different kinds—value resulting from the production of wealth, which adds to the aggregate of values, and value from obligation, which adds nothing to the aggregate of values, because,

as in the case of debtor and creditor, for example, what the owners of such value gain other units of the body economic must lose—he concludes that only those things are wealth within the purview of the economy called political, which have value from production. This is the only kind of value that implies an increase of the wealth of the Greater Leviathan or body economic. And this value comes exclusively from the application of man's energies to nature. "Wealth, therefore, in political economy, consists of natural products so secured, moved, combined, or altered, by human labor, as to fit them for human satisfaction." In short, it is "labor raised to a higher or second power, by being stored in concrete forms which give it a certain measure of permanence, and thus permit of its utilization to satisfy desire in other times or places."

And as wealth is stored labor raised to a second power, so capital "is stored labor raised to a still higher or third power, by being used to aid labor in the production of fresh wealth, or of larger direct satisfactions of desire." For capital is not a different thing from wealth, but is a part of wealth, differing from other wealth only in its use. Its function is not to satisfy desire directly, as is the case with other wealth, but to satisfy desire indirectly, through its use in the production of further wealth.

From these definitions it is obvious that money may or may not be wealth, and therefore may or may not be capital. Money which derives all its value from production, such as gold coin, Mr. George puts in the category of wealth; but that which derives its value partly from production and partly from obligation, such as silver, copper and bronze coin, he regards as partly wealth, while that which derives its value wholly from obligation, such as paper money, he does not regard as wealth at all. Yet money has to do with wealth and it must be defined in that connection, and George defines it as "anything which in any time and place is used as the common medium of exchange in that time and place." Its essential quality he holds to be not its form or substance, but its use, which is not that of being consumed but of being continually exchanged, nor that of being exchanged as a promise of something else, but as a finality.

Following his examination into the nature of wealth, George explains its production. This consists not in creation but in alteration. It has three

modes: Adaptation, which is the altering of existing things in place, form, condition or combination; growing, which is the utilizing of the vital or reproductive forces of nature; and trading, or exchange. In classifying exchange with production instead of distribution, George departs from the usual order; but upon reflection it will be seen that his classification must be adopted before the study of political economy can be said to rest upon logical foundations. Exchanging or trading so evidently increases the aggregate of wealth that its assignment to the department of production must be conceded to be sound. The factors of production which George enumerates are the familiar ones of land, labor and capital. But these factors are so carefully and accurately defined by him—"land" excluding everything that is not natural, "labor" excluding everything that is not comprehended in the term "man," and "capital" excluding everything that is not a product of labor from land—that the terms no longer seem to belong to that mumbly-cum-spludge, as a shrewd Canadian dubs it, which the university professors call "economics."

From production, George carries his inquiry over into the department of distribution. He does not regard this as separate and distinct from production, but as a continuation of it, the two things being two mentally distinguishable parts of one thing. He defines it as the division, not among persons or classes, but into categories corresponding to the factors of production, of the results sought for in production. Thus one share of products goes into the category "rent," corresponding to "land;" another goes into the category "wages," corresponding to "labor;" and a third goes into the category "interest," corresponding to the capital used. This distribution human law is utterly powerless to alter directly. To decree that rent, for illustration, should go to laborers, would not increase their income as laborers. Distribution is determined under existing industrial conditions, by natural law; and nothing but an alteration of those conditions can alter the operation.

In this department, distribution, and only here, George assigns a place to morals. The natural laws of distribution, he says, unlike those of production, are moral laws. The moment we consider distribution, the idea of justice becomes primary, for distribution underlies the assignment

of ownership of wealth. After some elaboration of the moral phases of distribution, the division of the book on that subject abruptly terminates, and except for the supplement on money, also abrupt in its ending, the book itself comes to a close.

Evidently George's death prevented his finishing his work. The chapters on distribution and those on money, are little if any more than introductory; and there are indications throughout the body of the work that the magic touches of his pen were lacking in the finish. Defects appear of which the hypercritical—too indolent to pick up the chain of reasoning where verbal links are missing, too malicious perhaps to overlook occasional sentences which from lack of finish are crude or obscure, too much lacking in generosity to assume that the master mind which could produce a "Progress and Poverty" would have left no such defects could he have put this last book through the press, and withal unable to answer George's arguments—will doubtless avail themselves gladly to belittle both the book and its now voiceless author. It is to the credit of Henry George, Jr., who with excellent taste and judgment has edited the manuscript, that he did not attempt to perfect it, but confined his corrections to evident verbal errors. He has given to the world Henry George's manuscript as Henry George left it, and for that, whatever supercilious critics may say, the world will be grateful. For in substance this manuscript is a priceless legacy. Incomplete though it be, and in some places crude for such a master of thought and of English expression as Henry George, the book is nevertheless both complete and sound as well as lucid, in its exposition of general principles; and from these an intelligent public will have little difficulty in making just deductions regarding current social problems. It is a contribution to economic science, moreover, which cannot be ignored, and which may be expected in a short time to give direction and character to economic study.

NEWS

Spain and the United States, as this issue of *The Public* goes to press, are upon the verge of war. Diplomatic negotiations appear to have come to a deadlock, and both countries are in suspense pending the delivery of President McKinley's message on the

subject, which is expected Monday next.

As is well known, this situation has developed out of the Cuban struggle against Spanish dominion. Cuba, lying hardly 100 miles south of our own territory of Key West, and almost the last of the Spanish possessions in America, having for one year in the last century passed under the control of the English, was returned to Spain in 1763, in exchange for Florida. Under the oppressions of severe taxation and of government by captain-generals, the people there became increasingly discontented with Spanish rule; but no uprising occurred—except a brief negro insurrection in 1844—until 1868.

The United States had become concerned with Cuban complaints during the administration of President Polk, who offered \$1,000,000 for the sovereignty of the island. This offer, which Spain indignantly refused, was made in the interest of the extension and perpetuation of southern slavery, as was the publication six years later of the Ostend manifesto by our ministers to England, France and Spain, who thereby joined in demanding that if Spain would not sell Cuba we should seize and forcibly annex it. Failing of its purpose, that manifesto became one of the factors in producing our civil war, during which the question of Spanish dominion in Cuba ceased to interest us. But the oppression still felt by the Cubans, had led up, by 1868, to the rebellion of that year, known as the "ten years' war."

This rebellion was under the military leadership of the West Indian officer who now commands the insurgent forces—Maximo Gomez. The United States became involved in 1873, when 52 Americans, captured upon the ill-fated *Virginius*, were shot by the Spanish authorities as pirates. War with Spain was then with difficulty averted; but it was averted, and the Cubans were left to make their own fight. This they did so successfully that in 1878 a treaty was made at Zanjón, in what is now the province of Puerto Principe, between Gomez, for the revolutionists, and Captain General Campos, for Spain, which granted a large measure of self-government to Cuba and promised the abolition of slavery within ten years.

The Spanish insist that the Zanjón treaty has been sacredly observed. Slavery, they say, was fully abolished

two years before the time stipulated, while the suffrage was promptly extended, the principle of self-government was recognized, and all the other promised constitutional reforms were carried out. This the Cubans deny. They claim that slavery had been virtually killed by the war, and that the royal decrees of abolition were consequently only perfunctory; that taxation without Cuban consent was persisted in; that Cubans were still excluded from all influential offices; that the Madrid customs laws were deliberately made oppressive to Cuba; that most of the Cuban deputies to the cortes owed their places to Spanish influence, while others were rendered powerless to accomplish anything; that the enormous taxes imposed upon Cuba were used, not for the benefit of the island, but for the enrichment of Spanish favorites sent to the island as officials; and that, in brief, the treaty of Zanjón had been made a hollow mockery.

These complaints grew until the revolutionists renewed hostilities by formally declaring war on the 24th of February, 1895. They were able at that time to maintain the rebellion only in the extreme western province of Santiago de Cuba. But by the middle of the year they were in possession of the adjoining province of Puerto Principe, and by its close had carried the war still farther west into the province of Santa Clara. The victories of the revolutionists caused the recall of the Spanish general, Campos. Gen. Valeriano Weyler was sent out to supersede him.

At the opening of the year 1896, the revolutionists pushed westward across the province of Matanzas, destroying the rich sugar growth as they passed, and menaced Weyler as soon as he landed in Havana. About the same time, another detachment of revolutionists entered the most westerly province of the island, Pinar del Rio, destroying the tobacco crops there, as the first detachment had destroyed the sugar crops in Matanzas.

All the provinces, except Havana, were thus occupied by the revolutionists; and, owing to their policy of avoiding pitched battles, in which the greater numerical strength of the Spaniards might have overwhelmed them, Weyler was unable to put down the rebellion by military means. He thereupon adopted a policy of terrorism, arresting and shooting revolutionary suspects, and, to starve out the revolutionary forces, hustling non-

combatants into garrisoned towns so as to prevent their engaging in production. Still the revolutionists were not subdued, and Weyler, after more than a year's experimenting, was, upon the accession of a liberal ministry to political power in Spain, superseded by Gen. Blanco.

The policy of concentrating non-combatants in the towns continued, however, and starvation and disease spread among them to such an extent that general attention in the United States was directed to their condition, and steps for their relief from this country were taken. Congress had long been restless regarding the Cuban situation, but both the Cleveland and the McKinley administrations had held their parties sufficiently in check to prevent any kind of recognition or intervention. But when an American battleship, the *Maine*, lying in Havana harbor as a friendly visitor, was destroyed, and 260 men on board were killed, under circumstances indicating Spanish treachery, public opinion in the United States rose to a pitch which, expressing itself through members of congress, forced the McKinley administration to take diplomatic action.

Urging his party in congress to prevent hostile demonstrations there, President McKinley undertook by diplomacy to make an adjustment of the Cuban question. In this matter the destruction of the *Maine* was an important item, but it was only an item. Independence for Cuba had by this time become with congress a *sine qua non*. Of the nature of the diplomatic negotiations nothing was publicly known, of course, but it was generally understood that the president was insisting upon Cuban independence, and that the Spanish ministry was stubborn upon that point. On the 1st of April, 1898, the reply of the Spanish ministry, supposed to be final, was received at Washington. Though no details were officially given out, it was understood to be in substance a rejection of President McKinley's proposition as to Cuban independence.

War seemed now inevitable, and congress was inclined to precipitate hostilities. But the president urged more patience, and still held out hopes of a peaceable settlement. This was the situation on the 1st, when congress adjourned over to the 4th with a strong disposition on the part of the democratic and populist members, together with enough republic-

ans to make up a majority, in the lower house, at least, to recognize Cuban independence and authorize armed intervention without further delay.

Meanwhile, public feeling in the United States had been further irritated by the departure from the Canary islands, off the northwest coast of Africa, of a fleet of Spanish torpedo boats. On the 2d of April this fleet was reported as having arrived at its destination in the harbor of Porto Rico. Its departure was, under the circumstances, distinctly hostile. There could have been no occasion for its presence in American waters except to destroy American battleships. Its reported arrival, therefore, in the neighborhood of Cuba, was regarded as a naval advantage which Spain had acquired through the dilatory policy of the president. On the 3d, however, news came, at first doubted but afterwards confirmed, that the Spanish torpedo fleet had arrived, not at Porto Rico, but at one of the Cape Verde islands, over 2,000 miles from Porto Rico, where it had been forced to seek shelter from a storm.

Spain had also sent two battleships from Havana under sealed orders, and had dispatched an armored flying squadron from home, the destination of which was unknown. Her navy yards also were kept busy. But neither was the United States idle. Her navy yards, too, had been kept busy; she had appropriated \$50,000,000 for defense; she was buying warships abroad; she was fortifying exposed places; she had posted a flying squadron at Hampton Roads; and in many other ways she had been making emphatic preparations for war. The state department had also warned her minister at Madrid, and her consuls and consular agents in Cuba, to be prepared to leave at a moment's notice.

It was reported on the 5th that Consul-General Lee and the other consular representatives of the United States in Cuba had been recalled, and six vessels were sent to Havana for the transportation of Americans who might wish to leave. On the same day the President completed his message to Congress on the Spanish situation. It was approved by the cabinet, and its delivery to Congress, which had impatiently awaited it for nearly a week, was promised for the next day. The 5th also brought news from London of the refusal of Great Britain to

unite with other European powers in an offer of mediation between Spain and the United States. France had suggested such an offer, and communications in furtherance of it were passing between the powers, but Great Britain's refusal to cooperate discouraged the movement. The proposed offer was not regarded in this country as friendly, and although Great Britain's expressed ground for refusal was that the Cuban question does not concern her, her refusal was understood to be an intimation of sympathy with this country.

At this writing Americans are leaving Cuba in large numbers and in great excitement, while rich Spaniards are resorting to all possible means of getting themselves and their portable wealth out of Havana. In Washington feeling is at fever heat. The delay of the president in sending in his message, promised for the 4th, and again for the 6th, but finally postponed until the 11th, is puzzling and irritating both congress and the public. The impression is abroad that when the message comes it will recommend armed intervention without recognizing the Cuban Republic. This policy is antagonized by the democrats and a large body of republicans in congress; and the Cuban officials announce that such intervention would be regarded on their part as an act of war against the Cuban Republic.

The Spanish trouble has naturally occupied exclusive attention in this country, but other parts of the world are in a ferment, too. News from the Egyptian Soudan indicates that war is on in earnest there. According to the cable reports, the Anglo-Egyptian troops, whose objective point is Khartoum, have captured Shendy on the east bank of the Nile, about 100 miles above Berber, the most advanced post heretofore occupied by them. One large body of dervishes had been massed at Shendy, and another farther up the river, at Omdurman, just across from Khartoum. The body at Shendy had been expecting an attack, but the Anglo-Egyptians were not yet ready to make one; so most of the dervish force moved out of Shendy, towards the Atbara river, whence it is supposed they intended to force the fighting by advancing upon Berber, the Anglo-Egyptian base, and attacking it from the desert. Discovering the depletion of the dervish force at Shendy, the Anglo-Egyptians easily

captured the place, after which reconnoitering parties discovered the dervishes entrenched near the Atbara river. This puts a new phase possibly on the situation in the Soudan. The Anglo-Egyptians are hurrying to complete railroad connections between Berber and Cairo, so as to be able to push troops into the Soudan as may be required. If undisturbed in these operations for a month or two longer, they have expected to crush the mahdist movement completely, though at the expense of at least two or three bloody battles. But Gen. Sir Herbert Kitchener, who, under the title of Sirdar, commands the Anglo-Egyptian troops, hopes that through his occupation of Shendy he may prevent the dervishes at Omdurman to the south, from rejoining those entrenched upon the Atbara to the north, and thus achieve a final victory much easier than he had hoped. On the 5th the Anglo-Egyptians made a reconnoissance in force in the direction of the dervish camp near the Atbara, and a skirmish with few casualties resulted.

In China, the process of partition is also leading on to possible war. The Russian government officially described, on the 2d, the ceremonies attending the Russian occupation of Port Arthur and Talienwan, in China. In accordance with the terms of the Chinese treaty, a detachment of Russian troops at Vladivostock was ordered on the 17th of March to join the landing parties of the Pacific squadron at Port Arthur. On the 27th, these troops having arrived, the Chinese troops began their departure from Port Arthur, the last column marching out at one o'clock on the morning of the 28th. Five hours later the Russians landed and began to occupy the forts. By eight in the evening they were in position, when Russian flags were run up on all the vessels of the fleet and Russian and Chinese flags on the forts, while salutes were fired by both ships and forts. A similar programme was carried out at Talienwan. Appended to this official description is an announcement that immediate measures will be taken for the effective occupation of ceded territory.

On the day of the Russian announcement, April 2, the British minister at Peking had a conference with the Chinese foreign office at which he is reported to have demanded territorial concessions for Great Britain. The demand is said to have been for a

lease of Wei-Hai-Wei, on the Shan Tung peninsula, after the Japanese shall have evacuated it, the object of the British being to secure an offset to the power which Russia has acquired in the same region.

This demand is contemplated by neither Russia nor Germany with satisfaction. Two days after it was made, a Russian representative informed the British minister at Peking that both Germany and Russia regarded England's action as tending to prevent the development of their enterprises, and the situation as serious.

In connection with these territorial concessions, accusations of Chinese official corruption are now being made by the Chinese themselves. A Chinaman of the highest rank is announced as having memorialized the emperor, bluntly accusing the Chinese foreign office of being in the pay of Russia, and specifically charging that 10,000,000 taels (about \$8,000,000) was spent in bribery during the negotiations for the concession to Russia of Port Arthur and Talienwan, of which sum Li Hung Chang received 1,500,000 taels, or about \$1,200,000. The memorialist demands a full investigation of his charges, asking, if they be proved, that Li Hung Chang be beheaded, and offering if they be not proved himself to submit to decapitation.

Rev. Dr. Charles A. Briggs, professor of Biblical theology in Union Theological seminary, a Presbyterian institution at New York, was recently confirmed in the Episcopal Church by Bishop Potter, and has now applied for reception into the Episcopal ministry. Prof. Briggs, it will be remembered, has been for seven years in uncomfortable relations with the Presbyterians. Charged with teaching that reason, apart from the Bible, is a source of Divine authority; that the church also is such a source; that errors exist in the original text of the Bible; that Old Testament predictions have not always been fulfilled, and the great body of Messianic predictions cannot be; that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch; that Isaiah was not the author of the whole of the book of Isaiah; that the processes of redemption operate in the next world; and that sanctification is not complete at death, he was acquitted in 1893 by the New York Presbytery, a majority of which was in sympathy with his heretical views. But upon appeal to the governing

body of the Presbyterian church in America, the General Assembly, he was adjudged guilty of "teaching the errors mentioned," and therefore of "violation of his ordination vows." He was accordingly suspended from the Presbyterian ministry. But as the General Assembly was unable to control Union seminary, Prof. Briggs has continued in his chair in that institution.

At the municipal election in Chicago on the 5th, 17 of the aldermen elected were republican (one of them to fill a vacancy) and 16 were democratic candidates. The other two ran as independents. There were populist candidates in six wards, who polled an aggregate of 1,078; in nine wards there were socialist-labor party candidates, who polled an aggregate of 886; and in one ward there was a prohibition candidate who polled 689 votes. What lends national interest to the result is its condemnation of the Allen law, under which the city is authorized to extend street car franchises for 50 years. The street car interests of Chicago fought hard to elect a board of aldermen from which extensions for that period could be obtained without compensation or reduction of fares, and to this end they influenced both the leading parties in their nominations. The result is regarded as an assurance that, at least with the mayor's veto against them, they will be unable to secure so long an extension, or any extension at all on those terms.

For much the same reasons that the Chicago election is of general concern, the election on the same day in Milwaukee also is. There the silver democratic candidate for mayor was elected by 8,700 plurality, and at least 26 out of 42 aldermen were returned, upon a platform which not only declared for free silver and the reduction of street car fares, but for municipal ownership of public utilities as well. Henry C. Payne, the monopoly magnate of Milwaukee, had forced his own candidates upon the republican primaries, and in the triumph of the silver democrats he was signally defeated. The social democracy had a ticket in the field, and Eugene V. Debs made a campaign for it in person. It polled about 2,500 votes.

In Cleveland, O., also, the street car question was involved in the municipal election. Mayor McKisson, a republican who achieved national

reputation last winter as the almost successful competitor against Mark Hanna for the Ohio senatorship, has long been fighting the Cleveland street car ring, of which Mr. Hanna is the head. At the republican primaries this year he defeated the Hanna faction in almost all the councilmanic districts. But at the election on the 4th, in consequence, it is charged, of a combination between the Hanna faction and a democratic leader of the name of Farley, who is understood to be connected with the street car ring, a gain of three democratic councilmen was made. It is feared that all these are under the control of the street railroads.

At Uniontown, Kan., the municipal election on the 5th decided a contest between a ticket of men and one of women, every candidate on the latter ticket being a woman and every candidate on the other being a man. The masculine ticket triumphed. The wife of the successful candidate for city attorney was defeated for police judge.

IN CONGRESS.

Week Ending April 6, 1898.

Senate.

The principal event of the 31st was the presentation of a resolution from the committee on foreign relations directing the president to purchase from Denmark the West Indian islands of Santa Cruz, St. Thomas and St. John, or any of them, for a naval station, and appropriating therefor the sum of \$5,000,000. But the sensation of the day turned upon the Cuban question. It began with a request from Senator Frye, of Maine, on behalf of the committee on foreign relations, for recommitment to that committee of its own resolution calling for the consular reports on the condition of the Cuban reconcentrados. Senator Allen, of Nebraska, responded with a speech advocating the immediate cessation of peaceful relations with Spain and the recognition by this country of the Cuban people's inalienable right to self-government. He was promptly followed by Senator Chandler, of New Hampshire, who, while formally expressing confidence in the committee on foreign relations, and in the patriotism and righteousness of the president's intentions, declared that he should "thank God when he reaches a conclusion of some sort or another," and contended that as the committee had the day before

advised a second call for the long-delayed Cuban consular reports, and now requested that the call should not be made, it ought to give some reason for the request. Senator Frye made a sarcastic speech in reply, and then renewed his motion to recommit, which was passed. Thereupon Senator Chandler reintroduced the committee's resolution, with a request that it go over to the next day; and Senator Frye gave notice that when this resolution came up he would move to recommit it to the committee on foreign relations.

That ended the incident for the day, the significance of which hung upon the fact that Mr. Chandler is a republican.

But Mr. Chandler did not remain of the same mind. On the next day his resolution was referred to the committee on foreign relations upon his own motion, accompanied with an expression of hope from him that it would have "deliberate consideration." Senator Allen wanted to know what had caused this change of mind, but Senator Chandler made no reply. On the same day a petition from "solid" citizens of Milwaukee, and one from the Quakers of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Delaware were presented remonstrating against war; which peaceable manifestoes were offset by a resolution from Senator Quay, republican, of Pennsylvania, instructing the committee on foreign relations to report, on or before April 5, a bill for the recognition of Cuban independence. In secret session the resolution for the purchase of the Danish West Indian islands was then discussed. The discussion revealed such wide difference of opinion that Senator Lodge, the author of the resolution, decided to press it no further at present, and it is now understood to have been dropped. It was opposed by both democrats and republicans.

Upon convening on the 4th, the Senate occupied the day chiefly with the delivery of set speeches on the Spanish difficulty, the general tenor of which was favorable to recognition of Cuban independence and in justification of armed intervention if necessary. Speeches along the same lines were delivered on the 5th. Notable among these was one by Senator Chandler which urged the prosecution of war for Cuban freedom.

In the senate on the 6th, as in the house, the attendance of spectators was extraordinarily large. The chamber was packed and thousands were

excluded. The sundry civil bill was considered while the senate waited for the president's message on Spain. After hours of waiting rumors gained currency that there would be no message on that day, and the crowd melted away. No legislative business of importance was done.

House.

On the 31st, Mr. Lewis, a democratic representative from Washington, aroused Mr. Johnson, an Indiana republican, by denouncing the proposition—which it is alleged the administration is fostering—that Cuba purchase her freedom, and by demanding war. In the face of a storm of hisses from the galleries, Mr. Johnson passionately besought the members to pause before plunging the country into a war, with its endless train of evils, and argued that, in the interest of peace, it were better that the Cubans pay \$100,000,000 for independence than that a drop of American blood be unnecessarily shed. At this, Congressman Bailey, of Texas, the democratic leader, declared his belief, from what Johnson had said, that the republicans purposed to compel Cuba to buy the freedom she had won. He, too, deplored war, but insisted that war could be averted by simply recognizing Cuban independence and leaving the Cubans free to achieve their own freedom. He added, however, that the voice of the democrats is: "Cuba free, without a war if possible; Cuba free, with a war if necessary." Grosvenor, of Ohio, republican, replied to Bailey. He denied that the republicans intended to force Cuba to buy her freedom, and significantly asked the meaning of the war preparations going on night and day if not that when action is taken looking to the independence of Cuba it will be backed up, if necessary, by the army and navy of the United States. After this the debate proceeded in desultory fashion, democrats advocating immediate intervention and the republicans urging delay pending the development of the president's policy.

The excitement had increased on the 1st, in consequence of the news from Spain, although the fervor of the oratory was subdued. But the debate was warlike. It related to battleships, torpedo boats and torpedo boat destroyers. The appropriation bill, being under consideration in committee of the whole, Mr. Cannon, chairman of the appropriations committee, proposed a substitute for the paragraph in the naval appropriations

which provided for three battleships, six torpedo boats and six torpedo boat destroyers. Upon this substitute, which would have reduced the number of battleships to one and increased the number of torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers to 12 each, the debate ebbed and flowed, until, by a vote of 78 to 124, the substitute was defeated. Upon the rising of the committee, the house adjourned till the 4th.

The only incident of importance on the 4th related to the Spanish question. Chairman Cannon, of the committee on appropriations, asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a measure permitting the general government, in cases of emergency, to build fortifications on private land without condemning the property, upon the written consent of the owner. Bailey objected unless the necessity were explained. He regarded it as a war measure, and before consenting wanted to know whether we were to have war or not. In further elaboration of his objection he made a speech which was applauded from the galleries, and the speaker threatened to clear the galleries if the applause were renewed. Several other members spoke, among them two democratic members of the appropriations committee; the latter advocated the passage of the measure. It was passed without division and the House adjourned for the day.

Nothing was said or done on the 5th regarding the Spanish trouble, the whole time of the House being taken up with the disposition of private bills.

The house was packed with spectators on the 6th, gathered to hear the president's message on the Spanish question and see what congress would do about it. Proceedings began at noon. Pending the arrival of the message the Hull bill for the reorganization of the army was discussed. Rumors as to the message meantime circulated. At first it was reported that the document would be delayed until 3 o'clock. Then the time was extended till 4. Finally it was authoritatively announced that there would be no message until Gen. Lee had departed from Cuba, the president regarding it as dangerous to the lives of our representatives in Cuba to communicate his recommendations prior to that time. The crowd dispersed, and the house, without having done any important business, adjourned.

NEWS NOTES.

—Rhode Island elects republican governor and legislature.

—Rebellion against the authority of Spain has again broken out in the Philippine Islands.

—Miss Jessie E. Parber was elected on the 6th, over the most popular man of Kendrick, Idaho, as mayor of the city.

—Captain General Blanco, of Cuba, published on the 31st a decree terminating the reconcentration in Pinar del Rio, Matanzas, Santa Clara and Havana, the four Cuban provinces to the west.

—Denmark's triennial elections for members of the Folkething, or lower house of parliament, have resulted in a victory for the extreme radicals. They have a clear majority of 13 in a house consisting of 114 members.

—The Canadian government has decided to erect military barracks at Fort Selkirk, at the confluence of the Pelly and Lewes rivers in the Yukon country, which makes that place, instead of Dawson, the virtual Canadian capital of the region.

—Gov. Pingree, of Michigan, complained by telegraph to the president on the 6th that the custom house collectors of Detroit and Port Huron are lobbying in the legislature against his measures for the taxation of railroads, promising federal patronage for votes.

—A gun which will throw a ton of dynamite a distance of five miles and destroy a battleship within 200 feet of the place where it strikes, has been invented by Hudson Maxim, brother of the more famous inventor of the rapid-fire gun. Smokeless powder, of a new kind, also invented by Hudson Maxim, is to be used in his dynamite gun.

—One of the two copies made by Jefferson from the original draft of the Declaration of Independence has been found among the archives of the American Philosophical society at Philadelphia. The other copy was reported to congress in June, 1776, and disappeared. The formal declaration as signed is in the department of state at Washington.

—Five hundred delegates from silver clubs met in convention at Indianapolis, on the 6th, for the purpose of cementing the free silver sentiment of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Kentucky so as to influence the democratic convention of 1900 and the

election to follow. The first day was devoted to speech-making, the chief speech being that of George Fred Williams, of Massachusetts.

—As the result of an unpremeditated duel upon the streets of Waco, Tex., between W. C. Brann, editor of the noted Brann's Iconoclast, and M. T. Davis, a good government club politician, which occurred on the 1st, both were wounded. On the 2d Mr. Brann died. The cause of the duel was a reflection made some months ago in the Iconoclast upon a local co-educational college.

—Ex-President Harrison, when approached on the 31st for an interview, declined to give any opinion, his reason being that he is charged with no responsibility in the matter himself, and would not do anything to embarrass those who are. "I am sure," he added, "that I can serve my country best by keeping silent just now, and perhaps others might help in the same way."

—The Canadian government announces that after July 1st the rate of interest to be allowed by the Dominion Government Savings bank will be reduced from 3 to 2½ per cent. Prior to last year the rate allowed was 3½ per cent. The reduction at that time did not check the increase of deposits, and the minister of finance estimates that notwithstanding the reduction in the rate now announced, the deposits will be \$1,000,000 more this year than they were last.

—President Diaz, in opening the spring session of the Mexican congress on the 1st, criticized the Mexican extradition treaty with the United States, which expires on the 28th of next January, because it enables common criminal offenders to resist extradition on the plea of being political offenders. Also, in an exhaustive review of international affairs, he congratulates Mexico upon the low price of silver, which, by causing a falling off of imports, has stimulated domestic manufactures.

—The colonial government of Cuba—not the insurgents, but the local government, which is under the protection of the Spanish troops—made an appeal on the 1st to the president of the United States to respect its rights. It claims to represent a majority of the people of Cuba, and in the name of the American principle of justice and liberty, protests against the imposition upon them by a foreign power, meaning the United

States, of a political regime—meaning the insurgent regime—which is contrary to its happiness and conscience. The appeal is signed by Jose Maria Galvez as “President of the Honorable Government of Cuba.”

—William J. Bryan, late democratic candidate for the presidency, granted an interview on the 31st, in which he said that humanity now demands the intervention of the United States in behalf of Cuba. While deploring war as a terrible thing, he insisted, nevertheless, that the sufferings of the Cubans, almost within sight of our shores, cannot be longer ignored, unless we as a nation “have become so engrossed in money-making as to be indifferent to distress.” And even if the question were pecuniary, he holds that the loss suffered by the United States and Cuba together far exceeds any gain which Spain could expect from victory, and that we, therefore, have as much right to demand the cessation of the Cuban war in the interest of the United States as Spain has to continue it for her own benefit.

MISCELLANY

Work thou for pleasure; paint or sing or carve

The thing thou lovest, tho' the body starve.

Who works for glory misses oft the goal;

Who works for money coins his very soul.

Work for the work's sake, then, and it may be

That these things shall be added unto thee.

—Kenyon Cox.

THE LION THAT TAUGHT SINGING SCHOOL.

This quaint little story originally appeared in a St. Nicholas of 1882, “just as it was told by a little girl five years old.” It ought to be reprinted once each decade until the coming children develop an ability to tell us stories yet more logical and more charming.

A lion wanted to teach singing school.

They asked him what could he sing?

And he said: “Roo-oo-oo.”

They asked him what else could he sing?

And he said: “Roo-oo-oo.”

They said they didn't want a singing teacher who couldn't sing nothing, but 'cept just one song.

Then the lion went to a horse race.

All the other animals were there; the mouse that squeaked, the kitten

that mewed, the puppy that bow-wow-ed, the lamb that baa-ed, the pig that yi-yi-ed, the colt that ha-ha-ed, the wolf that boo-ed, and the bear that ur-ur-ed.

The prize of the horse race was a russet apple.

The mouse thought he'd exprise the other animals, so he ate the apple up. Then all the other animals hollered out: “No fair! no fair!” and the mouse was scared and ran round the track, and the kitten that mewed ran after and ate the mouse up, and the puppy that bow-wow-ed ate the kitten up, and the lamb that baa-ed ate the puppy up, and the pig that yi-yi-ed ate the lamb up, and the colt that ha-ha-ed ate the pig up, and the wolf that boo-ed ate the colt up, and the bear that ur-ur-ed ate the wolf up—and the lion ate the bear up.

Then the lion came around again and wanted to teach singing school.

They asked him what could he sing?

And he sang: “Squeak squeak, mew mew, bow wow, baa baa, yi yi, ha ha, boo boo, ur ur, and roo oo oo!”

Then they said: “Your voice has re-proved.” And they all let him be their teacher.

A NAVAL LIVERY STABLE.

The maintenance of a great navy is a continual incitement to war, just as the maintenance of a stable encourages, or even impels a man to drive frequently. But if he goes to a livery for his vehicles he will only drive when he has good reason to do so. Therefore there seems to us much good sense in the following half humorous suggestion made by Harper's Weekly:

Chili has three warships in course of construction in England, and the Chilian representative in London is quoted as saying that he has had recent offers for them from six different powers. The briskness of this demand suggests that there might be economy and profit in keeping warships for hire. The demand for a large number of warships by a modern nation is analogous to the demand for a large number of carriages by a modern family. Occasionally a family has a funeral, or a wedding, and has temporary use for a lot of carriages, just as occasionally a nation has a war scare and wants all the floating iron in sight. But of course, if the average family attempted to maintain all the time carriages enough for its use at funerals, it would suffer great inconvenience from the expense of such a precaution. The cost of maintaining a huge stableful of warships is correspondingly inconvenient for nations. As livery stables meet the extraordinary demand for communities for carriages, so should be met the extraordinary demands of the world for warships. All families don't have funerals on the same day, so all nations do not, as a rule, have fights on hand at the same time. As it is possible for a family to engage a lot of carriages

for a certain date, so it should be possible for a nation to engage by cable as many warships as it thinks it will need for a given trouble. Of course there are inconveniences and objections to this plan, but there are huge inconveniences and terrible objections to the present plan. If a syndicate of capitalists should go into the business of keeping warships for hire, it seems likely that there would be a great profit in it. Of course the stock would lie idle a good deal of the time, but when the demand did arise there would be a fine chance for extortion. The property, on the whole, would be pretty safe property. The percentage of loss in warships for the last thirty years has been low. A few were damaged in the Chinese war, two or three have been accidentally sunk, but the foe that modern warships have most reason to fear is old age.

NO MEDICAL MONOPOLY.

The hearing in Boston, on March 2 and 4, on the bill to make it a misdemeanor to practice any branch of the healing art for hire in Massachusetts without a certificate from the state board of registration in medicine was very lively, and excited an exceptional degree of public interest. The bill seems to have been generally favored by the medical profession, and was opposed by Spiritualists, Christian Scientists, magnetic healers, druggists and persons who, though they personally preferred to rely on the ministrations of the educated doctors, were content to let their neighbors seek cures wherever they thought they might find them. The hearing was before the legislature's committee on public health. The most notable speeches against the measure were made on March 2 by William Lloyd Garrison and Professor William James. Mr. Garrison's plea was simply for liberty. He reminded the committee of the long and bitter fight against homeopathy, and of how that method of cure had finally won recognition and equal rights. “I come,” he said, “as a citizen jealous of all infringements of the law of equal freedom.”

Professor James, “as a citizen who cares for sound laws and for the advance of medical knowledge,” protested against the bill. He spoke of the imperfect and experimental state of all medical knowledge. He intimated that the regular physicians knew their own methods and no others. He doubted if a single doctor who denounced mind-cure methods had taken the trouble to follow up a mind-curer's cases and acquaint himself with the results. Then he said:

“I am a doctor of medicine, and count some of the advocates of this proposed law among my dearest friends, and well

do I know how I shall stand in their eyes hereafter for standing to-day in my present position. But I cannot look on passively, and I must urge my point. That point is this: that the commonwealth of Massachusetts is not a medical body, has no right to a medical opinion, and should not dare to take sides in a medical controversy. In the particular business of mental healing there can be no doubt that if the proposed law were really enforced it would stamp out and arrest the acquisition of that whole branch of medical experience. The mind-curers and their public return the scorn of the regular profession with an equal scorn, and will never come up for the examinations. Their movement is a religious or quasi-religious movement; personality is one condition of success there, and impressions and intuitions seem to accomplish more than chemical, anatomical or physiological information. These are the facts, gentlemen. You as legislators are not bound either to affirm or deny them yourselves, or in any way to judge them from a medical point of view, but simply, after ascertaining that thousands of intelligent citizens believe in them, decide whether to legislate or not. Do you feel called on, do you dare, to thrust the coarse machinery of criminal law into these vital mysteries, into these personal relations of doctor and patient, into these infinitely subtle operations of nature, and enact that a whole department of medical investigation (for such it is), together with the special conditions of freedom under which it flourishes, must cease to be? I venture to say that you dare not, gentlemen. You dare not convert the laws of this commonwealth into obstacles to the acquisition of truth. You are not to ask yourselves whether these mind-curers do really achieve the successes that are claimed. It is enough for you as legislators to ascertain that a large number of our citizens, persons as intelligent and well-educated as yourselves or I, persons whose number seems daily to increase, are convinced that they do achieve them. Here is a purely medical question, in which our general court, not being a well spring and source of medical virtue, must remain strictly neutral under penalty of making the confusion worse."

Professor James has thus been quoted at some length because it does not seem probable that the argument against legislative interference with mental healers will be more weightily put than he has put it. The subject is one of considerable current importance, and one in which Professor James—a physician by education and a psychologist by profession—ought to be peculiarly qualified to speak. He has looked into the various methods of mental healing, and thinks he has found in them germs of truth too valuable to be stamped out.

Yet he is disinterested. He said in his speech that if one single type of practitioner had to be singled out for license he would vote without hesitation for the Harvard medical school type, but he found no necessity for such exclusive selection.

There were many other addresses, and at the second hearing some instances were given of Christian Science cures.

On March 7 the committee reported against the bill.—Harper's Weekly.

THE PROGRESSIVES' VICTORY IN LONDON.

The London county council has been fighting for its life. The two programmes in the campaign just ended turned on its future power and functions. For ten years it has administered as a political unit the confusion of parishes and districts which made up the greater London. During the whole of this period the Progressive party has held the reins, and has taken hold of work formerly left to private initiative or performed for the public by private contractors. It has cleared away slums and built much-needed and profitable workmen's dwellings and lodging houses. It has constructed the (free) Blackwall tunnel under the Thames, demonstrating to the world the practicability of the underground electric railway system proposed by the Rapid Transit commission in New York city. Finally, it has protected the ratepayers against "rings" of builders by establishing a works department. This department was brought into existence when the builders were believed to have unduly inflated their tenders out of spite because trade union wages and conditions were rigidly enforced.

In the recent campaign the "Progressive" party appealed to the London voters for support on the ground of the administrative work performed in the past as well as that promised in the future. The future work outlined, however, was of the highest importance. The programme included municipal ownership and working of the street "trams"—which must in time be replaced by electric cars—and the municipalization of the water supply. London is supplied by eight water companies; their prices are high, and the water pressure is so low as to increase seriously the dangers of fires. But far more serious than either of these evils is the fact that the water is not satisfactory in point of purity.

The opposite party, who in the council termed themselves "Moderates," favored, at the instance of Lord Salisbury, giving up some of the great powers possessed by the council to small

municipalities to be created by future legislation. Lord Salisbury and the cabinet said they were in favor of dividing London into ten or a dozen municipalities, but that they would not finally draft the bill until they had heard the views of the people. Lord Salisbury urged every conservative and "unionist" elector to vote for the moderate candidates. As London is a conservative city, he hoped the "moderate" party would be sufficiently strong to induce the county council to curtail its powers. The extraordinary anxiety displayed by Lord Salisbury and his friends to persuade London to go contrary to the prevailing tendency of large centers of population, viz., toward unification, was believed to be mainly due to the following resolution passed by the county council in 1897 on the recommendation of their local government and taxation committee:

"That it is desirable that a new source of revenue should be obtained by means of some direct charge upon owners of site values."

Under a law that would not be tolerated in the worst-governed city in America, the ground landlords of London, wealthy owners like the Duke of Bedford and Lord Salisbury himself, do not directly contribute to the expense of London government. The renters pay all the taxes (or rates) for the public improvements which add to the value of the land. If the city should be broken up into independent districts, it was believed that the taxation of ground rents would be long postponed, and that even when this reform came, land in the richest districts could not be taxed for bettering the condition of the poorest. This, however, was not the only reason why the conservatives stood for decentralization. If the government could persuade the London county council practically to annihilate itself, the difficulty of municipalizing the tramways or the water supply would be greatly increased.

These, then, are the broad issues upon which the contest was fought. Lord Rosebery, as an ex-chairman of the London county council, appealed to London to preserve its unity. Mr. Bryce and other liberals of national influence supported him. Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. A. J. Balfour, the great lieutenants of the unionist government, supported Lord Salisbury and attacked the "socialistic" tendency of previous county councils.

A noteworthy feature of the contests was, as usual, the fascination they had for peers of the realm. By an old law peers are forbidden under penalties to interfere in the people's free choice of their parliamentary representatives.

But in the county council elections peers are often candidates, and the last council included about a dozen. Although English voters are still influenced by men's rank, this influence counts for less as civilization advances and manhood ripens. At the recent elections a gratifying number of peers on both sides were defeated by commoners.

The result of the elections may be regarded as a crushing defeat of the "moderates," with the decentralization or disintegration of London as the main plank of their platform. The progressives have carried about three-fifths of the districts. This, of course, is a great relief to this party, whose working majority during the last three years has been but two, and at crucial moments has sometimes fallen to zero. The rate-payers of London have pronounced so decisively against any partition of their great city that the county council is not likely to be even asked to give up any of its powers. The city remains an organism, with the county council directing its energies of every kind to promote the well-being of the whole.—The Outlook.

HOW SHALL WE CONTROL THE POWER OF THE SPEAKER?

In the current *Cosmopolitan* John Brisben Walker makes a study of the dangerous power of the speaker of the house of representatives, and offers the following suggestions as to its curtailment:

Is there any simple way by which the speaker may be relieved of his now dangerous authority and the power re-confided to the representatives of the people? In the light shed upon the subject by the experience of other parliamentary bodies the matter does not seem impossible. The chief difficulties concern:

First. The appointment of the committees, in whose hands must rest those important investigations upon whose thoroughness and final accuracy the action of the houses must often depend.

Second. The power to advance legislation to a final vote.

Third. The relegation of all private business to properly constituted courts of claims.

Fourth. The confinement of the speaker's duties to the exercise of entirely impartial courtesy and the according of equal privileges to friend and foe.

The first of these may be met by the selection in caucus of a tactical committee by each of the parties — this tactical committee to be charged with the duty of selecting the representatives that its party shall have on each of the house committees. This would be less simple than selection by the

speaker, but the result would really represent the sanction of the members. Then the tactical committee representing the party in the majority would nominate the first name on each congressional committee, that of the minority the second, that of the majority the third, and so on, alternately.

The second difficulty, involving the selection of the legislation most important to the country, should be met by giving the tactical committees of the two parties the determination of the order in which legislation shall come before the house. After recognizing the appropriation bills as non-partisan, the party in the majority should be entitled to nominate that measure which shall have precedence over all others, except appropriation bills. The majority having selected what it regards as the vital measure of the session, the minority comes forward with its selection; then the majority nominates a second measure and the minority follows with its second, and so on alternately.

In this way the house would again become a legislative body acting as a committee of the whole on legislation of vital importance. The parties, knowing that they would be committed to the consideration of a measure after it had been nominated and posted by them, would select with the greatest caution, while the house itself would be compelled to give earnest attention to that important legislation which most nearly concerns national interests.

The third difficulty would be removed by modeling the speakership on that of the British house of commons. Of the English speaker, Bryce says:

"The note of the speaker of the British house of commons is his impartiality. He has indeed been chosen by a party, because a majority means in England a party. But on his way from his place on the benches to the chair he is expected to shake off and leave behind all party ties and sympathies. Once invested with the wig and gown of office he has no longer any political opinions, and must administer exactly the same treatment to his political friends and to those who have been hitherto his opponents, to the oldest or most powerful minister and to the youngest or least popular member. His duties are limited to the enforcement of the rules and generally to the maintenance of order and decorum in debate, including the selection, when several members rise at the same moment, of the one who is to carry on the discussion. These are duties of great importance, and his position one of great dignity, but neither the duties nor the position imply political power. It makes little difference to any English party in parliament whether the occupant of the chair has come from their own or from the hostile ranks. The speaker can lower or raise the tone

and efficiency of the house as a whole by the way he presides over it; but a custom as strong as law forbids him to render help to his own side even by private advice. Whatever information as to parliamentary law he may feel free to give must be equally at the disposal of every member."

The fourth difficulty concerns the immense private business which comes before the house of representatives and which should properly go before courts of claims. This burden has become each year more onerous. Its tendency is toward a complete paralysis of debate upon those measures which most concern the public. But so much of the personal influence of members is derived from the aid which they render to claimants that a proposal to relegate the business to special courts would doubtless be strongly opposed.

Nevertheless the question must soon be met. Wire-pulling and log-rolling have been in a large measure substituted for argument. It is a growing belief that the best results are to be obtained by keeping the time of the house free for debate. The business office of the member, with its littered desk, its coming and going clerks and pages, absorbing the attention of the occupant, must be swept from the floor of the house.

Truly representative government requires that the members must come to the hall for instruction and thought upon the chief matter in hand, rather than upon petty details which have no real bearing on public affairs. They must come to listen as well as to be heard. The courtesy of attention must be given at all times and must be expected. This would quickly do away with sham speeches and bring the debates up to a higher intellectual plane.

Under the existing conditions there is a strong tendency toward trades and combinations which would make of the congressman a smart log-roller rather than a thoughtful legislator. Some years of close observation gave me the impression that the intellectual level of the congressman in Washington was rather lower than the plane he had occupied at home. The atmosphere of high discussion, which he had expected to find, is missing, and he too often sinks into a man of petty trades, ready to wrest from the nation financial advantages for his constituents, at whatever sacrifice to the people at large.

He is kept so busy by the demands from office seekers, pensioners and general claimants that he has no time for proper study of the questions under debate, or even to keep up with the current literature of the subject. Were the floor of the house given up to carefully prepared discussions of important measures, he would not only have his mind equipped by that which he would hear, but he would be compelled himself to study carefully if he would exact

the respect of his fellow members. As the matter now stands it would be impossible to conceive of any system less calculated to bring about the results sought from representative government.

CIVIL SERVICE.

There are a good many examples in history where republics have gone down on account of the spoils system. No more striking example, perhaps, than that of the French republic that grew out of the French revolution. When Napoleon took charge of the army in Italy, starved, half clothed and poorly armed—when they had crossed the Alps and looked down on the valley of Italy, he said to them:

"In that valley lies everything that you need—wealth, fame, honor. It is yours for the taking, and on your return from this expedition every one of you shall have the wherewithal to purchase six acres of land."

The republic had rejected all attacks of royalty and held out its hand to the people. It had extended the knowledge of the rights of man, even as far as Russia, and made despots tremble in their own palaces. Under the watchword of equality and fraternity they had brought hope to dethroned humanity the world over. But as soon as these people learned, as they did later on, when Napoleon invaded their country, that they were coming not to establish a freer and better government, but to plunder and rob them of the accumulations of their labor, then the reaction set in against the revolution until finally it culminated in the overthrow of Napoleon.—Jerry Simpson in the House, January 11.

OUR CZAR.

A story illustrating the qualities which have given the sobriquet of "Czar" to the present speaker of the house is told by John Brisben Walker in *The Cosmopolitan*:

The hour was that in the day which properly belonged to such business. Speaker Reed was in the chair. It so happened that there was a momentary lull in the business of the house. The leader of the opposition was known to have on his desk a resolution recognizing Cuban belligerency.

"Mr. Speaker!" he said, as he rose to his feet.

The floor was almost clear, and the figure of the gentleman demanding the speaker's recognition stood out conspicuously. The distinguished gentleman whose name is so closely identified with tariff measures sat at his desk absorbed in some figures and oblivious of all things around him.

"Mr. Speaker," repeated the leader of the opposition.

The eye of Speaker Reed was fixed intently upon an immense perspective which seemed to lie beyond the head of the gentleman from Maine. Suddenly his lips moved with the formula:

"The gentleman from Maine moves that the house do now adjourn. Do-I-hear-a-second?—The-motion-is-seconded—The-question-is-now-on-the-motion-to-adjourn—All-in-favor-will-say-aye—Those-opposed-no—The-ayes-hav-e—T-h-e-h-o-u-s-e-s-t-a-n-d-s-a-d-j-o-u-r-n-e-d!"

Mr. Dingley, who had sat intent upon his figures, now looked up with a puzzled air. He had not uttered a sound. If there had been a "second" it must have come from the ghostly perspective into which Mr. Reed's eye seemed to be reaching. The republican members had been so taken by surprise that not half a dozen had voted on the motion, but nevertheless the house stood adjourned, by the power, sole and individual, of the man whom it had chosen to register its will, deliberately exercised.

An unknown paragraphist magnificently interprets the life and work of Jean Francois Millet, saying: "I know little of Millet's history, but it might well be this:"

I come from the fifth estate of man; the Brown Land where the sky is gray and cold, with none but ominous gleams and a few quick passing shafts of sunlight traveling along the furrows—nay, from the very borders of the sixth estate, where the light is darkened in the heavens thereof, and where none but God and good angels follow the retreating forms of the inhabitants into the mysterious glooms where no man cares for their souls. I come from the very womb of toil and hardship, and because of the ascetic strength of soul which God gave me I went upward to fetch the implement of art, that I might monumentalize what the dwellers in the first, second and third estates will not consider or care for. I will compel some of them to reflect and force them to see the furrows of the vast estate where all the roots of their comfort and prosperity lie forgotten, while on the side of the oppressor there is power.

A notable incident in the matter of irrigation is the annual fair that is held in Nebraska, where exhibits of produce raised through this method of cultivation are made. These exhibits and the annual meeting in that state of the friends of irrigation are spreading the cause rapidly through the entire arid and semiarid territory and bringing about a change in the farmers' methods. It is even declared that farmers in the east will learn in time that it will pay for them to have a storage reservoir—they are made easily by

scooping out a pond and allowing cattle to trample its bottom solid and hard—as the best way of forestalling a drought. It is also asserted that eastern farmers, like hundreds of farmers in Kansas and Nebraska, will see the utility of having a pond of water where a fish supply may be cultivated for household uses, and where in winter ice in large quantities may be gathered.—Harper's Weekly.

According to the current report of the Consumers' league of the city of New York, the following prices are paid at the present time in New York for work done in tenement houses:

Cambric dresses, with lined waists and some trimming, \$1.20 a dozen.

Nightgowns, with tucked yokes (thread furnished by the maker) and insertion (cut by the maker), one dollar a dozen.

Silk waists, 98 cents a dozen.

Women's wrappers, 49 cents a dozen.

Coats are being "finished" at 36 cents a dozen.

Shirts, 30 cents a dozen.

Aprons, 22 cents a dozen.

Neckties are being made at \$1.25 a gross.

Knee pants, 50 cents a dozen.

Vests, one dollar a dozen.

Trousers, 12½ cents a pair.

Coats, 32 cents each.

Percentage off for boss sweaters and deduction for cost of cartage.

The Nile cataracts, we learn from the *London Spectator*, are to become a memory. The khedive has approved a contract under which English engineers are to build a dam across the Nile at Assuan, drowning the cataracts, and turning the river above into a vast, if very narrow storage reservoir. The surplus water thus held back will be sold for systematic irrigation.

According to Mr. Thomas B. Reed a critic has described Mr. Gladstone as "not only sitting down to the political game with an extra deck of cards up his sleeve, but also profoundly convinced that the extra deck in question had been placed there by the Holy Ghost itself."

According to a statement prepared by the bureau of naval intelligence the United States, with her ten new ships, bought and ordered, will stand sixth among the navies of the world. Spain's navy ranks seventh.

READERS who find this paper interesting or useful, are requested to bring it to the attention of their acquaintances, and also to forward the names and addresses of such persons as they think might become subscribers after seeing sample copies. For full information, see the publisher's notice at the top of the first column on the first page.